

## REMARKS

### 1. Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended the title to be more clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants have also updated the current status of U.S. Patent Applications mentioned in the specification.

### 2. Renumbering of Claims

Applicants apologize for any confusion or additional work caused by the Applicants' accidental submission of two sets of claims (i.e., claims 1-64 and claims 2-23). Applicants have cancelled claims 1-64 included in the original application and have amended the claims submitted in the preliminary amendment filed 12/29/2003 to be appropriately numbered.

### 3. Claim Amendments

Applicants have reviewed the claims for antecedent basis problems as suggested by the Examiner and made several amendments to remove any potential ambiguity. Applicants believe the remaining claims to have proper antecedent basis for each element, but welcome the Examiner's identification of any perceived problems.

### 4. Rejection of Claims 2-23 (now claims 65-86)

The Examiner rejected claims 2-23 (now 65-86) under 35 U.S.C. 112 as both failing to comply with the written description requirement and with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner identified claims 5, 8, 10, 16, 19, and 21 (renumbered as 68, 71, 73, 79, 82, and 84). However, the specification provides support for all of the pending claims throughout the text including those claims specifically identified. For example, a stated objective of the application in the "Summary" section is a "compiler for NCL" (NetBoost Classification Language) that "[g]enerates code for multiple processors" (page 10, lines 17-18). As described, the system includes a classification engine (CE) which is a "microprogrammed processor" (page 64, line 15). The specification further states that the CE's microassembly language "can be generated automatically from a compiler which translates CE program from a higher-level language such as NetBoost Classification Language (NCL)" (page 83, lines 21-23). The Classification Language itself is described in great detail in its own section and lists a sample syntax of the instruction set statements in the language, a corresponding description of each statement, and sample usage of the statements to process network packets (pages 105-page 126). In particular, this section describes the recited "protocol" statement (claims 68 and 79) on pages 111-112, the recited "demux" statement (claims 71 and 82) on pages 113-114, and the recited "set search" statement on pages 118-119 (claims 73 and 84). Due to the specification passages identified above providing both written description and enablement of the recited limitations, in addition to other passages interwoven throughout the specification, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Applicant : Narad  
Serial No. : 10/748,311  
Filed : 12/29/2003>  
Page : 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 42P8220C11  
Intel Docket No.: P8220C11

5. In the event that any additional information is required, please call the undersigned attorney at 978-553-2060.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/2/05



Robert A. Greenberg  
Reg. No. 44,133  
Intel® Americas Attorney

c/o BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200